

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are currently pending, and claims 1, 6-11, 14, 15, 23, 25, and 28 have been amended. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on December 22, 2004. During the interview, deficiencies in the Willis and Devine references were discussed in relation to subject matter of the present invention. Namely, it was discussed that Willis shows a system interface linked to a legacy system, but does not disclose the system interface also being linked to an intranet that is distinct from the legacy system such that a remote computer may be directed to the intranet as well as the legacy system via the system interface. It was further discussed that Devine shows a system whereby an intranet that is a middle-tier network linking a front end system with a back end legacy system so that a remote user connected to the front end system has access via the intranet to the legacy system. Devine does not disclose a system interface such as the front end system that is linked to both a legacy system and an intranet distinct from the legacy system, since the intranet is the basis for accessing the legacy system in Devine.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-28 stand rejected as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of co-pending Application 09/892,663. A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome this rejection.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Willis (US Pat 6,738,815). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claims 1 and 11 refer to the intranet as being distinct from the legacy system. For example, amended claim 1 recites, in part, wherein the systems interface is

adapted to direct communications from the computer from the at least one network address to a separate network address corresponding to the intranet that is distinct from the legacy system. Thus, claim 1 is related to a system interface that may direct communications of a computer to the legacy system or to the intranet. Support for the intranet that is accessible from the system interface being distinct from the legacy system that is also accessible via the system interface is provide throughout the specification, such as the example shown in Figure 2.

Willis fails to disclose these recitations. Willis discloses that the system interface provides the remote computer with access to legacy systems. However, there is no disclosure of the same system interface also providing the remote computer with access to an intranet that is distinct from the legacy system. The Office Action stated that the legacy systems were part of an intranet, and therefore, the Office Action is in agreement that there is not an intranet distinct from the legacy system. Accordingly, Willis fails to disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 11 such that claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Willis. Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-14 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, one or more of these claims recite additional features that are allowable over Willis.

103 Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 7, 14, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Stone (US Pat 6,101,510). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Butts (US Pat 6,233,541). Claims 8, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Devine (US Pat 6,598,167). Claims 18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis and Stone in further view of Devine. Claims 23-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine in view of Stone. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

(As with claims 1 and 11, claims 15, 23, and 28 also refer to the intranet being distinct from the legacy systems. As discussed above, Willis fails to disclose that the

system interface directs communications to the legacy system and to an intranet distinct from the legacy system. Of the other references, the Office Action has relied only upon Devine as providing a system interface to a legacy system. However, in Devine, the system interface or front end system is linked to the back end or legacy system via the intranet itself, which acts as a middle-tier network. Because the legacy system is accessed via the intranet, the front end system of Devine fails to provide access to legacy systems as well as an intranet that is distinct from the legacy systems. Therefore, these cited references, singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the elements of claims 15, 23, and 28 such that these claims are allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons. Dependent claims 16-22 and 24-27 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, one or more of claims 16-22 and 24-27 recite additional features that are allowable over the cited references.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-28 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2004


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093